

ARMENIAN LIBRARY OF THE CALOUSTE GULBENKIAN FOUNDATION  
BIBLIOTHÈQUE ARMÉNIENNE DE LA FONDATION CALOUSTE GULBENKIAN

ՆՈՅԿՈՒՆ ՄԱՏԵՆՈՇՈՐ ԳՈՐԾԻՍ ԿԻԼԵԴԵԼՈՆ ՆԻՄԱՐԿՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ

ARMENIAN STUDIES  
ÉTUDES ARMÉNIENNES  
IN MEMORIAM HAÏG BERBÉRIAN

DICKRAN KOUYMJIAN  
Editor



CALOUSTE GULBENKIAN FOUNDATION

(Lisbon, 1986)

This material is presented solely for non-commercial educational/research purposes.

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF ARMENIAN *l* AND *ḷ*

JOHN A. C. GREPPIN

Haig Berbérian's last paper, «Une racine arménienne méconnue: *al-*» (1974) (1) dealt with an interesting root. Cautiously, Berbérian sidestepped the question of etymology, avoiding mention of two problematic solutions, one offered by Werner Winter (1965.105) (2) and another by Klingenschmitt (1970.79-83) (3). One of the critical problems for the etymologist in this root is the question of the Armenian velar *l*, for we do not have, in all instances, good rules for formulating the development of IE *\*l* in all its positions in Armenian. We are unable to determine other than in the most general terms, when IE *\*l* will produce Armenian palatal *l*, and when it will produce Armenian velar *l*. In his *Esquisse*, Meillet (1936.173, 182, with references) gave a few general rules, some of which followed from an earlier paper of his on that same subject (1911) (4). Pedersen also made some comments in his omnibus article «Armenisch und die nachbarspra-

(1) In this paper, Berbérian dealt with an extremely varied system of suffixes which the root *al-* attracted.

(2) Winter suggested a derivation from IE *\*plOti-* (> *alač'-em*) from which also Lat. *(im)plōro* (< *\*pleO-s-*). Under normal conditions we would expect IE *\*plV-* to yield Arm. *IV-* (*li* 'full' < *\*pleE-*). Winter's proposal of *\*plO-ti-* > *\*palo-ti* demands of laryngeals in Armenian something that most are not willing to grant.

(3) Klingenschmitt has proposed rapport with Gk. *ἰλάσκεισθαι* < *\*σι-σλα-σκεσθαι* 'to appease', Goth. *sēls*, OIr. *slān* 'healthy', Lat. *sōlor* 'to comfort', IE *\*selA-*. The cognates beyond Greek seem to present certain semantic barriers, and the Armenian proto-form *\*sḷA-ske-(ye-)* has some phonological weaknesses, one being comparable to Winter's.

(4) Meillet's principles will be recounted later in this paper.

chen» (1906.354-355, 407-408) (5). But no single work, or collection of works, can account for the diversity of reflexes found in such words, to mention only a few, as *c'elumn*, *helumn*, *malem*, *k'alem*, *dal*, *al*, or account for the variation found within reflexes of individual roots such as *alam*, *alawri* but *aliwr*; or *dalar*, *dal* but *delin*.

This paper will survey the various instances of Armenian *l* and *l'*, and will also show that their development is more orderly than the ostensible facts would suggest. Altogether, there are over 100 Armenian words of direct Indo-European origin that show a *l* or *l'*; from Iranian and Greek loans we have another six dozen. These words will comprise the corpus this study is based on. Our first point of departure will be an examination of Arm. *l* and *l'* where they appear in words from Greek or Iranian stock, the largest sources of loan words in Armenian. Iranian necessarily has a small inventory of words with *l* since Indo-European *\*l* was regularly converted into Iranian *r*. And Hübschmann (6), whose list of Iranian loan words is incomplete (7), could cite less than twenty examples of an Armenian reflex of a loaned Iranian lateral from a total of nearly 700 roots passed on into Armenian. However, those Iranian roots that do appear are almost entirely reflected in Armenian with a velar *l* (8), except when *l*-initial. Those words that differ, having a palatal *-l'*, such as *spasalar* (9) 'general of the army', or *palapan* (10) (= [*balaban*]) 'Saker Falcon' (Greppin 1978.68) are narrowly used in Armenian, and appear in a very technical sense. Almost consistently they are words that were used only in the literary language, never being part of the popular spoken vernacular. Their use in Armenian was artificial, and the

(5) Pedersen's discussion dealt primarily with *\*-lC-* sequences.

(6) *Armenische Grammatik*, 1897; reprinted Darmstadt 1962. Hübschmann paid very close attention to loan words, a view that was central to his thesis of 1875. In addition to Greek and Iranian loans, he also listed Syriac, Romance and Arabic loans.

(7) Dr. Paddy Considine (University College, London) is preparing *The Iranian Loan Words in Armenian* which will account for many of the discoveries since the time of Hübschmann.

(8) This parallels the reflex found in borrowings from the Anatolian languages, both Urartian and Hieroglyphic Luwian. For a current bibliography, see Greppin 1980.

(9) *Yov. Kar.* 245, 270: *Handerj spasalar ew payazat gndiwn. Spasalar gndiwn varelovk'.*

(10) *Abraham Pol.* 181: *Palapan, k'an zpazan bazay mec ē zorawor ew alačayē.*

evidence for the movement of Iranian *l* to Armenian palatal *l* is not significant; overwhelmingly Armenian velar *l* is the common reflex of Iranian *l* (11).

The case for Greek loans is slightly different. Hübschmann (1897.336-389) (12) noted more than five hundred Armenian words of Greek origin, at least a tenth of which appear in Armenian with *l* or *ł*. This gives us a lexical corpus to work with that is of sufficient size for one to make some precise conjectures. First, it can be noted that velar *l* is the most common reflex of Gk. *λ*. And of those words with palatal *l*, most are found in Armenian texts translated directly from Greek. Note Gk. *τροχίλος*, Arm. *trok'ilos* 'Black-headed Plover' (Greppin 1978.112-113) which appears in Pisidius and Philo (13). Additionally, a great number of words with Armenian palatal *l* appear in Middle Armenian texts; these words again had little currency in the vernacular. An example would be Mxit'ar Goš's use (*Law Code*, twelfth century) (14) of Gk. *μαγκλάβιον* 'a strap for chastising offenders' (= Lat. *manus* 'hand', *clavus* 'nail, spike'), Arm. *manklaw*. There are even unusual reflexes, note Arm. *Hellēn* with its most uncommon double *ll* (Gk. *Ἑλλην* «Greek»), a stable form that evolved by pedantic etiology (15).

The crucial point in dealing with Greek loans is their appearance in the Armenian Bible and fifth century texts. Only two words in the Bible exist with a palatal *l* rather than the expected velar *l*. One

(11) Arm. velar *l* is also uniquely derived from an Iranian *r*; Av. *sāravāra* 'helmet', Arm. *salawart* 'id'.

(12) Hübschmann, initially a specialist in Iranian languages, probably derived many of his Greco-Armenian correspondences from the *Nor Bargirk' Haykazean Lezui* (Venice 1836, 1837) where the editors carefully noted the Greek correspondences to the Armenian words.

(13) *Pisid. Vec'*. 1900.983: *Isk ayl haw bnaworcal, (orum anun ē trok'ilos)* "Ἀλλή δὲ τις πέφυκεν ὀρνέον φύσις. Here the Greek text makes no mention of *τροχίλος*, and Pisidius provided it, normalizing the spelling found in the earlier Philo, *Loys*. 1822.155 (for which the Greek, from which the Armenian was derived, has been lost): *K'anzi kc'ordutiwn uni kerakroy, ew zoyg zsa bašxcāl tani: Ew znoyñ zays atrokilosn amenec'un arnel....*

(14) *Or zkargaw iwrov yawur martin zanc' arnē, manklawov cecen* (cit. *NHB*). For the most recent edition of the laws, see Mxit'ar Goš, *Girk' Datastani*, ed. Xosrov T'orosyan, Erevan, 1975.

(15) There is even an instance of Arm. *l* reflecting an intervocalic *gamma*, Arm. *alarikon*, Gk. *ἀγαρικόν* (Lat. *agaricum*) 'a type of fungus, larch fungus, tinder fungus?' (*Haybusak* [1895] vacat).

is *balistr*' (= Gk. *βολίστρα* = Lat. *ballista*) 'an engine used to throw stones' (*Jer.* 9.8). Since this word commonly appears elsewhere (16) as Arm. *balistr*, we may assume that the Armenian biblical manuscript shows some learned tampering. On the other hand, Arm. *p'ilon* (= Gk. *φελόνην* for *φαινόλης*) 'a type of cloak' (*I Chron.* 1.53) appears to be used artificially, for the word has no proper Armenian synonym, nor was it even known to the Armenians except academically. Another example of Armenian palatal *l* in an uncommon word from a fifth century text is Xorenac'i's use (17) of Arm. *stratelat* (= Gk. *στρατηλάτης*) «a commander of an army». Again, the term had no Armenian value, and the exact Greek spelling was used narrowly. Such curiosities could be continued, though uneventfully, and the list could be called a catalogue of hypercorrections; they are not uncommon at any level of Armenian literature (18).

Conclusions are fairly straightforward. As in Iranian loan words with *l*, Greek words with *λ* appeared in Armenian with velar *l* (but initially with *l-*); when this is contradicted the explanation rests in the learned or artificial use of a word whose foreignness was to be marked by hypercorrect spelling. There are no instances to my knowledge of an Iranian or Greek *l* being reflected as an Armenian palatal *-l-* when the word was abundantly and commonly used.

The Indo-European situation is not as simple. Meillet (1936) left us with a number of rules which he summarized on pages 173 and 182. One statement is entirely correct, that *\*lC* passes to Arm. *lC*. Another statement «Arm. *l* est la forme de *\*l* employée devant voyelle» is pretty much unworkable, for it does not explain a multitude of words some of which were listed on the first page of this essay. Meillet also has a few *ad hoc* rules covering narrow situations, some of which are workable, and some of which are not. On page 43 he says that the *l* of *kalin* has been derived by analogy to the genitive *kalni* (where the sequence *\*lC* regularly would produce Arm. *l*). This is contra-

(16) E.g. *Mnac*<sup>5</sup>, 1899.15 (fifth century).

*Ew arar Ozia yErusalem mek'enays xorhrdovk' imastut'ean, zi lic'in i veray aštarakač'n ew i veray ankeanc'n balists ew vëms mecamecs: Mxit'ar Goš. Balistr, sur ē erasayr, zor unim zinuork' mtraks erivarac'.*

(17) *Movsēs Mat.* 1865.254: *Ew vash k'o ararak' stratelat z Vardan zordi ordiac'eloy k'o, ew yarājin vardapetsn grec'ak' zMesrop:*

(18) They even occur in common words; note Hübschmann's reference (1897.387) to Arm. *p'salmos* for the standard *salmos* 'psalm'.

dicted by such a word as *p'aylun* 'clear, shiney, brilliant' (Skt. *sphu-linga-* 'spark') whose genitive is *p'aylnoy* and shows no influence from its morphophonemic shift which Meillet has purported for *kalni*. Quite the opposite! The *l* in the genitive of *p'aylnoy* has been maintained on analogy with the nominative. Meillet also tells us (p. 47) that final *\*-l* should be *-ġ*, and that the genitive of *al* (*ali*) gets its velarization also by analogy. Yet a regular final Armenian *-ġ* < *\*-l* is difficult to assume when the Armenian infinitive is clearly palatal: *\*-VI* (19). Thus Meillet has left us with a number of statements that are not only incomplete, but inappropriate.

To examine the problem of the development of *\*l* in Armenian, I have used as an inventory all those Armenian words with velar *l* or palatal *l* that appear in Pokorny (1959), Solta (1960), Meillet (1936) Hübschmann (1897), as well as those etymologies of more recent origin that were mentioned by Rudiger Schmitt in his excellent *Forschungsbericht* (1972). Since the list is quite long I cannot comment on each word individually; however, I will try to evaluate each word that creates ostensible problems. The conclusions that will be reached are as follows:

*Rule 1.* Initial IE *\*l-* passes to Armenian *l-* in all instances. Arm. *loys* 'light', Lat. *lux*; Arm. *lam* 'weep', Lat. *lāmentum*; etc.

*Rule 2.* Word final pre Armenian *\*-l* passes to Armenian palatal *-ġ*. Arm. *dal* 'yellowish', Gk. *θαλλός*; Arm. *jil* 'sinew, vein', Lith. *gỹsla*; etc.

*Rule 3.* Non-final postconsonantal *\*-l-* passes to Armenian palatal *-ġ-*. Arm. *glem* 'turn', Lat. *volvo*; Arm. *kianem* 'swallow', Skt. *girāti*; etc.

*Rule 4.* Final postconsonantal *\*-l* passes to Armenian velar *-l*. Arm. *astl*, 'star', Lat. *stella*; Arm. *ett* 'place', Lat. *sella* (< *\*sedla*); etc.

*Rule 5.* Preconsonantal *\*-l-* passes to Armenian *-ġC*. Arm. *olb* 'lament', Gk. *ὀλοφύρομαι*; Arm. *alb* 'dung', Hitt. *salpa-* (Schindler 1978.45); etc.

*Rule 6.* Intervocalic *\*-l-* passes to velar *VIV*. Arm. *kalin* «acorn», Gk. *βάλανος*; Arm. *elēgn* 'reed pipe', Gh. *ἐλεγος*; etc.

*Rule 7.* The Armenian sequence *\*-l-l* passes to *-l-l*. Arm. *kalal*

(19) The etymology of the Armenian infinitive is not entirely clear, but it seems it would be allied with numerous Indo-European verbal patterns in *\*-l-*, such as the Tocharian gerund in *-l* (*kenāl: šāmam ma ñomā kenāl* «er (ist) nicht mit dem Namen Mönch» [Krause-Thomas 1960.186]), or the Slavic past tense marker *-l* (я жил в Ереване).

'den', Lith. *guõlis*; Arm. *aleln* 'bow, rainbow', Gk. *ὠλένη* (this etymology is questionable); etc.

Needless to say, there are many ostensible contradictions. These I will now explain, though briefly for there are too many for each to be noted. The explanations will be sufficient to give one a clear idea of the procedures I am invoking.

*Rule 1: \*-l > Arm. l-.* There are no contradictions. This rule applies not only to words of Indo-European origin, but to loan words as well. In the very few instances where we have an Armenian initial velar *l-*, such as *loyion* 'babblers, a bird' (<Hindi *ghuiyām* 'id' [Greppin 1978.212]), it will be noted that the words are unusual, or have unusual surroundings.

*Rule 2: \*-l > Arm. -l.* There are a few exceptions. Some can be dismissed because they are based on faulty etymology; others are also able to be dismissed since they do not reflect an original final *\*-l* in preArmenian. Those exceptions that are based on faulty etymology are as follows. Arm. *ewl*, 'oil', Gk. *ἐλαιον* 'id'; Hübschmann (1897.393-394) says *ewl* cannot be of either direct Greek origin, or of Indo-European origin. He lists Arm. *ewl* with his «Armenische Lehnwörter unsicherer Herkunft.» Arm. *ul* 'stair, bridge', ORuss. *улица* 'street'; Pedersen (1906.459) correctly calls this etymology «fraglich.» Arm. *xal* 'game', Lesb. *ἀχολος* 'restless', Gk. *χαλᾶω* 'to loosen, slacken', IE *\*ghə-lo-*. This etymology, suggested by Pisani (1944.167) with further combinations of *xalalem* 'be calm' after an original idea by Meillet (1935.111) is doubted by Frisk (*GEW* 2.1066-1067 «fraglich»). Meillet has no good reason to posit *\*kh*, and IE *\*gh* simply cannot provide Armenian *x* (20).

Four more Armenian words in final *-l* may be accounted for by showing that they were, originally, *\*-lC*. Arm. *gol* 'thief', Gk. *ἀλίσκομαι* 'steal', Thess. *ἑλισκομαι* (Greppin 1976.185-86), Goth. *wilwan* 'steal', Lat. *vello* 'snatch, pluck'. The Latin word, *vello* (< *\*wel-s-*) provides us with pArm. *\*wol-s-* from which we would expect a final *-l*; Arm. *gol* thus follows regularly from *\*wol-s-*. Arm. *al* 'salt', Gk. *ἅλς* may be viewed similarly: IE *\*sal-s*. Meillet (1936.47) prefers to view the original form as *\*sal-i* after OCS *solī*, which he feels helps explain the *-i* stem category of *al* (gen. *ali*). This is unne-

(20) The function, however, of IE *\*ph*, *kh* and *th*, if they exist at all, is an area that is not properly explored in Armenian. The tentative probings by Hiersche (1964.232-253) leave too many questions unanswered.

cessary since the *-i* stem category became prolific in Armenian, and replaced with ease other earlier paradigms (21). Arm. *helēl* (< \**helhel* 'torrent') is complicated. Simply, the *-l* of the stem *hel* (Meillet 1916) can be explained by a proto-form of \**pel-n-* since this word is further related to Arm *luanam* 'wash' and *lhum* 'fill' which ties in directly with Skt. *prñāti* 'fills'. However, if we are to consider *olol* 'innundation' of Hittite origin, by loan (Puhvel 1977.598), and further recognize that reduplicated roots in Armenian of direct Indo-European origin exist slimly if at all, then we would have cause to wonder if the genetic path IE \**pel-n-* > Arm. \**hel* is in any way valid. Finally, consider the form *ĵil* 'nerve, sinew'. Hübschmann's mention of this (1897.486) is unfortunate since the spelling *ĵil* is considerably more common and shows the expected post-consonantal *-l* (cf. Lith. *gýsla* 'vein'). Arm. *ĵil* is simply a dialectal variant.

Two other words of Indo-European origin end in *-l*, but in their case, the final *-l* does not reflect an Indo-European termination, but rather a later suffixation from an independent source. Arm. *erkiwl* 'fear', Gk. *δῖϕτελδω* 'fear', IE \**dwe-*; for the non Indo-European suffix *-iwl* see Greppin 1975.105. Arm. *kalal* 'den, lair', Lith. *guõlis* 'camp', IE \**gʷl-*; for the non Indo-European suffix *-al*, see Greppin 1975.36-37. PreArmenian \**kal-al* passes to *kalal* (see Rule 7). A third word, *cnawl* (*-õl*) 'parent' presents a difficult problem. Traditionally the word had been spelled *cnoł*, with a short *-ol*, and did not differ in orthography from our newer form. Meillet (1903.502-503) mounted a case to distinguish between *-ol* and *-õl* (*-awl*) (22), a distinction that was made in some early manuscripts of the Gospels. Meillet felt these earlier spellings reflected two separate origins and semantic values. His argument was quite solid; he listed three examples: *cnawl* 'parent', *sermanawl* 'sower', *šinawl* 'builder'; to these may be added *orsõl* 'hunter' and *ganjõl* 'hoarder'. Meillet felt that these words with the agent suffix *-ol* (*-awl*) must be kept separate from adjectives in short *-ol* (*kerol* 'eating' [as well as *kerõl* 'eater'], *arbec'ol* 'drinking' [as well as *arbec'õl* 'drinker'], *šnac'ol* 'constructing' [as well as *šnac'õl* 'constructor']). Later, in his *Esquisse* (1936.32) he derived *-awl* (*-õl*) from IE \**-ā-tl-* (23), a suffix which corresponded to the

(21) CArm. *cov*, *-u* 'sea' has passed, for instance, to *cov*, *-i*.

(22) The contrast of suffixes in *-õC* and *-oC* remain quite problematic. See Greppin 1974.69-71.

(23) On the shift \**-Vt-* to Arm. *-aw-* see Greppin 1978A. 283-285.



Slavic agent suffix *-tel.*; *cnawł* would then be quite close to Gk. *γενέτωρ* / *γενέτης* 'begetter'. I find Meillet's argument difficult to ignore, though there is one crucial problem, and that is the uniqueness of *\*-tel* in Slavic, on which the Armenian form is dependent (24). The Slavic form (as in Russ. *блюситель* 'guardian' or *зватель* 'caller') apparently was secondarily derived in Slavic, by dissimilation from an earlier *\*-ter*. The development of Slavic *\*-tel* was thus necessarily later than the common Indo-European period, a fact that makes it impossible for it to have influenced the Armenian form. Armenian could thus only have produced *-awł* independently, and for this we must have in Armenian mechanisms that would bring the change from *\*-ter* to *\*-tl-* about; these we do not have. It seems clear that Meillet is correct in requiring a distinction between *-ol* and *-ōl*. What is lacking is any way to show that *-ōl* is of Indo-European origin.

Rule 3: *\*Cl- > Cl-*. There are no contradictions.

Rule 4: *\*-Cl > -Cl*. There are no contradictions.

Rule 5: *\*-IC(-) > \*-IC(-)*. There are no contradictions. Such a word as *arewelk* 'the East' is of course a petrified plural: *arewel-k*.

Rule 6: *\*VIV > VIV*. The apparent exceptions that occur (Arm. *alik*, *gelumn*, etc.) may be explained by showing that these sequences were originally *\*-VI* in preArmenian, and that the final *-VC* was a suffixation within the Armenian period. Other examples (Arm. *eluzanem*, *olok*, etc.) are based on faulty etymologies. Those that show an original preArmenian division *-VI* + later suffixation are as follows: *malem* 'crush, maim, castrate'. A simplex *mal* 'wether, castrated sheep' (Lat. *molo* 'crush, grind', Gk. *μύλη* 'mill', *μυλ(λ)άς* 'whore', *μυλλός* 'a cookie in the shape of the female private parts') is apparently the simplex upon which the later forms were derived. *P<sup>c</sup>aylakan* 'lightning' (Skt. *sphulinga-* 'spark'); a simplex *p<sup>c</sup>ayl* 'shiny, bright' exists. *Julem* 'to cast, smelt', (Gk. *χέω* 'id', IE *\*ǵhew-l-*). There is a simplex, *joyl* 'smelted'. *Gelumn* 'twist' (Lat. *volvo* 'turn'). There is a simplex *gel* 'tight, twisted' (25). *C<sup>c</sup>elumn* 'cleaving, rending; cleft, rent'; Gk. *σκάλλω* 'cut, hack', IE *\*skel-*. The root *c<sup>c</sup>el* does not independently exist yet there is a clear morphological break from which the verb *c<sup>c</sup>elem* is derived. *Awelel* 'to sweep' (Gk. *ὀφέλλω*

(24) It should also be born in mind that Slavic-Armenian isoglosses are most uncommon, and like Germanic-Armenian parallels, they frequently are strained.

(25) Pokorny (1959.1141) continues Arm. *gil* 'small stone for throwing' with this group, but it cannot be so.

'sweep', *ծփելա* 'broom' IE \**Obhel-*). A simplex *awel* 'broom' exists. *Alik* 'wave' (Gk. *πολιος* 'grey [of the sea or of hair]', IE \**pl-*). This word stems from the preArmenian stem \**al* plus the suffix *-ik* (Grep-pin 1975.99).

A few Armenian words in palatal *VIV* cannot be of Indo-European origin, as has been suggested (26). Arm. *eluzanem* 'produce, sprout up'. This etymology, repeated in Solta (1960.244 [Meillet, Hübschmann vacat]), compares the Armenian word with Lith. *liáudis* 'people', OHG *liut* 'id', Gk. *ἐλευθερός* 'freedom'; there is no acceptable way to derive Arm. *z* from IE \**dh*. Further, the semantic support is weak. Arm. *olok* 'shin bone' (Lith. *alkūnė* 'elbow'. Gk. *λοξός* 'slanting, ἄλλξ, ἄλαξ: πῆγυς [Hesych.], Russ. *локать* 'elbow'). In spite of Frisk's support of this collocation (*GEW* II.136-137) there seems to be no really obvious connection between Arm. *olok* 'shin bone' and the other words 'elbow, slanting, forearm' other than being sections of limbs. Fraenkel (1962.8) would prefer to connect Lith. *alkūnė* with Gk. *ὠλένη* 'elbow' which Arm. *olok* would not merge with well; the two forms from Hesychius defy a clear description; and Beekes (1969.22) also finds the contrast of Arm. *olok*, Gk. *λοξός* unappealing. A final etymology, Arm. *holovem* 'to roll' (Gk. *πόλος* 'axis, pole', IE \**k<sup>w</sup>ol-*), is quite impossible for there is no good evidence for the passage of \**k<sup>w</sup>V-* to Arm. *h-* (despite Winter 1955.5).

Two sets of words, *alam*, *alawri* and *aliwr*; *dal*, *dalar*, and *delin* have internal contradictions. Let us consider each set separately.

Arm. *dalar* 'green' and *dal* 'yellowish' are clearly cognate to Gk. *θέλλω* 'bloom', *θαλλός* 'a shoot', IE \**dhl-*. Arm. *dal*, the simplex, conforms to Rule 2 which requires the final post-vocalic \**-l* to pass to Arm. palatal *-l*. But *delin* 'yellow', which surely must be from the same root, has a velar *-l* in addition to its full grade of root. Further,

(26) There are several words in *VIV* which have etymologies which must be rejected. Arm. *alawni* 'dove, pigeon' cannot be related to IE \**albho-* 'white' since most doves and pigeons are, in fact, not white. Further, the white dove is a late arrival in the Armenian area (Grep-pin 1978. 127-132). Arm. *calik* 'flower', Hesych. *γελεῖν* 'be radiant'; the semantic rapport is too loose. Arm. *elevin* 'cedar', Gk. *ἐλάτη* was rejected even by Hübschmann (1897.442) as «sehr unsicher». Arm. *eluk* 'disgrace, disaster', Lat. *lugeo* 'mourn' is semantically too loose. Arm. *k'alak* 'city', Gk. *πόλις*, IE \**pwolis* (!) was suggested uneventfully by Winter (1955.8). Arm. *olork* 'sleek, level, smooth', OIr. *lerg* 'level' is possible, from IE \**Ologr-*, but an additional form, Arm. *lerk* 'hairless, bald' (Solta 1960.440), just muddies the water.

the simplex *del* 'medicine, spice' shows a final *-l*. There is no clear solution to this problem though I might make two speculations. One would be that *del(in)* is derived from the Anatolian substratum by loan, a source that would necessarily yield a velar *l*. Another suggestion would be that IE *\*dh<sub>l</sub>* differed from IE *\*dhel-*; the former was an *\*-os* stem, the latter was a stem in *\*-s* (as shown in Goth. *dals* 'dale', OIc. *dalr* 'id'), and as with Arm. *al* (< *\*sal-s*), the original was *\*dhel-s* from which we would expect Arm. *del*. The difficulty with this solution is that Armeno-Germanic isoglosses are among the least trustworthy parallels that we can project.

The second triad, *alam* 'grind', *alawri* 'millstone', and *alewr* 'meal, flour', is equally difficult. Arm. *alam* is clearly parallel to Gk. *ἀλέω* 'grind', Skt. *ānu-* 'powder-like' (< *\*al-nu-*), Av. *aša-* 'ground' (< *\*arta-*). *Alawri* closely conforms to the Indo-European pattern of Gk. *ἀλετρεύω* 'to grind' and *ἀλετρις* 'female slave who grinds grain'. Arm. *alewr* is very much like Gk. *ἄλευρον* 'wheat flour'. All would seem to stem from IE *\*alE-* (27); Hübschmann (1897.339) prefers to view Arm. *alewr* as a Greek loan word, a difficult decision since Gk. *λ* generally appears in Armenian as velar *l*. However, Hübschmann's decision appears to be correct, for in the fourteen places where Gk. *ἄλευρον* appears in the Old and New Testament, it is reflected exactly by Arm. *alewr* in all but one instance (28). Clearly, the appearance of Arm. *alewr* instead of *\*alewr* is the result of learned tampering.

This leaves the problem of Arm. *al-*, the stem of *alam* and *alawri*. It would seem appropriate to expect a velar *l* in *alawri* since it is *\*VIV* and directly continues the same sequence as in Gk. *ἀλετρεῖω* (29), the stem of *ἀλετρεύω* 'to grind' and *ἀλετρις* 'female slave who grinds corn'. This does not explain *alam*, however, for though Armenian *-a-* stem verbs may be denominative (*orsam* 'I hunt', ← *ors* 'a hunt'), a denominative formed from *alawri* would be *\*alawram*, not the *alam* we have. The other origin for *-a-* stem verbs, given by Meillet (1936.110, followed by Godel 1975.123) is from a suffix *\*-ā-ye-*, which would

(27) The final laryngeal is suggested by Hamp (1970.228) and is apparent in Gk. *ἄλητον* 'flour'. A commonly given cognate, Gk. *ἀλέτριος* is reported in Meillet (1936.142) from Hübschmann (1897.414) but must be acknowledged as a ghost word.

(28) The one exception is *Hosea* 8.7 where Gk. *ἄλευρον* is reflected by Arm. *xiws*.

(29) For the passage of *\*-etr-* to Arm. *-awr-*, see Greppin 1978A.288.

provide an preArmenian form of *\*al-ā-ye-* (30) in which the *\*l̥* would be intervocalic, and would therefore provide the velar *l* we have in *alam*. However, the history of the origin of Armenian *a-* stems is a murky area, and firm conclusions cannot be held on the basis of our present information.

*Rule 7: PreArmenian \*l̥-l < -l-l.* There are no exceptions

It remains to make a final comment on the root *al-* which Berbérian discussed in 1974, for it is a particular interesting root. The etymologies mentioned in footnotes 2 and 3 above do not seem possible, and it would appear that we have no sure evidence pertaining to an Indo-European heritage. However, the suffixal alternation found in *al-awt̥* 'prayer', *al-ač̣em* 'to pray' corresponds exactly with *canawt̥* 'knowing', *čanač̣em* (< *\*canač̣em*) 'know', the root of which is IE *\*genH-* (31). Could then this alternation be of Indo-European origin? Only one other root shows the alternation *-awt̥/-ač̣em*, and that is *amawt̥* 'shame', *amač̣em* 'be ashamed', and it is not Indo-European. Likewise, *c'aygawt̥* (*ar̥nem*) '(to leave out) at night' (*c'ayg* 'night'), which has no extension in *-ač̣em*, is also not Indo-European though its verbal form *c'aygawt̥ ar̥nem* corresponds to the periphrasis found in *alawt̥ ar̥nem* (= *alač̣em*). There are no other Armenian verbs in *-ač̣em* (32). Frisk (1936.35) investigated the suffix *\*-th-* in Indo-European; in his paper he explored the possibility that Arm. *-awt̥* was a reflex of an earlier Indo-European pattern. Though he found Skt. *-thu-* and *-thi-* likely parts of an Indo-European paradigm, he felt it unlikely that Arm. *-awt̥* could be allied («scheint mir etwas unsicherer») (33). Thus it seems difficult to view the alternation *-awt̥/-ač̣em* as an inherited Indo-European pattern, and Arm. *al-* must somehow be derived from the substratum.

In conclusion, the seven rules proposed in this paper seem to cover all situations that arise. Initial, final post-vocalic, and nonfinal postconsonantal *\*l̥* give Armenian palatal *l̥*. Final postconsonantal, preconsonantal, and intervocalic *\*l̥* give Armenian velar *l̥*; velar *l̥* may also arise from palatal *\*l̥* by assimilation.

(30) If we are to accept a form *\*alE-*, we would then project IE *\*alE-ā-ye-*.

(31) For which Beekes (1969.166, 281) suggests *\*genA-*, *\*gnoA-*.

(32) Arm. *barač̣em* 'bellow', *karač̣em* 'roar', *harač̣em* 'sigh', and *šarač̣em* 'rumble' are all derived from stems in *-ač̣em* (*barač̣em*, *karač̣em* 'etc').

(33) If, however, the stem *alawt̥* is from an Indo-European pattern *\*al-V-tl-*, then the root we have, *al-* would be appropriate. But the identity of the *-V-* remains most obscure.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beekes, R. S. P.

- 1969 *The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Greek*, The Hague, Mouton.

Berbérian, Haïg

- 1974 «Une racine arménienne méconnue: *ab*», *Anantapāram Kila Śabdaśāstram...*, *Księga pamiątkowa ku czci Eugeniusza Śluszkiewicza* (Jan Reychman, ed.), Warsaw, Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Frisk, Hjalmar

- 1936 «Gibt es ein indogermanisches *-th-* Suffix im Armenischen?», *Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift*, vol. 42, pp. 26-37. Reprinted (1966) in Hjalmar Frisk, *Kleine Schriften zur Indogermanistik und zur griechischen Wortkunde*, (Studia Graeca et Latina Göthoburgensia), Goteborg, Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

Godel, Robert

- 1975 *An Introduction to the Study of Classical Armenian*, Wiesbaden, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

Greppin, John A. C.

- 1974 «Comments on some Armenian Suffixes of Substratum Origin», *Linguistique Balkanique*, 17.3, pp. 65-71.  
 1975 *Classical Armenian Nominal Suffixes: A Historical Study*, *Studien zur armenischen Geschichte*, Vol. XV, Vienna, Mechitharisten-Buchdruckerei.  
 1976 «Gk. *οὔλος* 'baneful'», *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 60, pp. 177-186.  
 1978 *Classical and Middle Armenian Bird Names: A Linguistic, Taxonomic, and Mythological Study*, Delmar N. Y., Caravan Books.  
 1978A «The Sequence *awC-* in Classical Armenian», *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 92, pp. 282-293.  
 1980 «'Hittite' Loan Words in Armenian», *Proceedings of the VI Fachtagung für indogermanische und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*, Vienna, pp. 203-207.

Hamp, Eric

- 1970 «Sanskrit *duhitā*, Arm. *dustr*, and IE Internal Schwa», *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 90, pp. 228-231.

Haybusak

- 1895 *Haykakan busabarut'wn*, Venice, San Lazzaro.

Hiersche, Rolf

- 1964 *Untersuchungen zur Frage der Tenues Aspiratae im Indogermanischen*, Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz.

Hübschmann, Heinrich

- 1875 «Ueber die stellung des armenischen im kreise der indogermanischen sprachen», *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 23, pp. 5-49.

- 1897 *Armenische Grammatik*, erster Teil, *Armenische Etymologie*, Leipzig, Breitkopf und Härtel.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert  
 1970 «Griechisch ἱλάσκεσθαι», *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 28, pp. 71-88.
- Krause, Wolfgang and Thomas, Werner  
 1960 *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*, Band I, *Grammatik*, Heidelberg, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Meillet, Antoine  
 1903 «Quelques anciens manuscrits de l'évangile arménien», *Journal asiatique*, II, pp. 487-507.  
 1911 «Remarques sur les l de l'arménien classique» *Yušarjan, Grakan žolovacoy ar'iw 100 amey yobelini hastatman Mxit'arean miabanut'ean i vienna (1811-1911)*, Vienna, Mekhitarist Congregation. Reprinted in A. Meillet, *Études de Linguistique et de philologie arméniennes*, Louvain, Imprimerie Orientaliste, 1977, pp. 151-154.  
 1916 «Latin pluit et arménien helum», *Mémoires de la société linguistique de Paris*, 19, pp. 178-180. Reprinted in *Études (supra)*, pp. 161-164.  
 1935 «Les sourdes aspirées en arménien», *Bulletin de la société de linguistique de Paris*, 36, pp. 109-120. Reprinted in *Études (supra)*, pp. 274-285.  
 1936 *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique*, Vienna, Imprimerie des PP. Mekhitharistes.
- Pedersen, Holger  
 1906 «Armenisch und die nachbarsprachen», *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 39, pp. 334-484.
- Pisani, Vittore  
 1944 «Armenische Studien», *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 68, pp. 157-177.
- Pokorny, Julius  
 1959 *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern and Munich, Franke Verlag.
- Puhvel, Jaan  
 1977 Review of Friedrich/Kammenhuber, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 97, pp. 596-599.
- Schindler, Jochem  
 1978 «Hittite šalpa-», *Die Sprache*, 24 1, p. 45.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger  
 1972 «Die Erforschung des Klassisch-Armenischen seit Meillet (1936)», *Kratylos*, 17, pp. 1-68.
- Solta, Geor Renatus  
 1960 *Die Stellung des Armenischen im Kreise der indogermanischen Sprachen: Eine Untersuchung der indogermanischen Bestandteile des armenischen Wortschatzes (Studien zur armenischen Geschichte, IX)*, Vienna, Mechitharisten-Buchdruckerei.

Winter, Werner

1955 «Problems of Armenian Phonology II», *Language*, 31, pp. 4-8.

1965 «Armenian Evidence», in *Evidence for Laryngeals*, pp. 100-115, (W. Winter, ed.), The Hague, Mouton.

#### ARMENIAN TEXTUAL SOURCES

*Abraham pol.* Abraham k'ahanay Polsec'i, *Kendanabanut'iwn*, Venice, Matenadaran MS no. 1418. Sections of this manuscript have been printed and discussed in *Bazmavēp*, 55, 1898, January, pp. 1-6; February, pp. 66-74; March, pp. 120-128.

*Movsēs mat.* *Movsēsi Xorenac'woy matenagrut'iwnk'*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, Venice, 1865.

*Mx. ar.* *Arakk' Mxit'aray ew Ołompianos*, Venice, 1854.

*Mnac'.* *Noragiwt girk' mnac'ordac'*, ed. Xalat'ean, Moscow, 1899.

*Yov. Kat'.* *Patmut'iwn Yovhannu Kat'olikos*, Tiflis, 1912.

*Pisid. vec'.* *Pisideay vec'oreayk'*, Venice, 1900.

*P'il. liws.* *P'iloni ebrayec'woy Bank' Erekk', č'ew i loys əncayealk'*, vol. I, Venice, 1822, pp. 123-172.